

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 2 and 4-10 were allowed, and claims 11-16 were rejected. With this paper, none of the claims are amended, none are canceled, and none are added.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Guscho (WO 01/48531, Guscho hereinafter).

In rejecting claims 11 and 14, both independent claims, the Office asserts that Guscho teaches "the enhancement electrode structure (42) being arranged in the proximity of the signal electrode structure (3) (see figures 22a-b)." (See page 3, lines 7-8 and page 4, lines 14-15 of the Detailed Action)

In fact, the signal electrode structure 3 is shown in Figure 1 of Guscho, where a cell of a light modulator is illustrated as having two electrodes: the signal electrode 3 and a support electrode 6. Guscho further discloses that the signal electrode 3 in each cell of the light modulator may be made in the form of bands, concentric rings, a matrix of elements, or elements of any other structure 42 (page 49, lines 21-23). Figures 22a and 22b show that the signal electrode 42 is not in one section as the signal electrode 3 in Figure 1, but in multiple sections. Each section of the multiple section electrodes 42 is connected with a switch device 41 and each switching device 41 is connected to the line bus at one inlet and the column bus at another inlet (page 49, lines 24-27). Individually, each section of the signal electrode 42 is functionally equivalent to the one-piece signal electrode 3 illustrated in e.g. Figure 1. Further, because the signal voltage to each cell is not varied from one section of the signal electrode 42 to another, the entire electrode 42 is functionally equivalent to the one-piece signal electrode 3 in Figure 1.

Furthermore, if, as the Office asserts, the enhancement electrode structure 42 is arranged in the proximity of the signal electrode structure 3, there should be such a separate electrode structure 3 showing alongside the electrode structure 42 in Figures 22a and 22b. Actually, what is shown in Figures 22a and 22b is that the signal electrode 3 in Figure 1 being replaced by the

signal electrode 42, not that both electrode 3 and electrode 42 are on the same figure.

Therefore, Guscho does not disclose "the enhancement electrode structure being arranged in the proximity of the signal electrode structure."

Based on the above, claims 11 and 14 are not anticipated by Guscho. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 11 and claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 14. For the same reasons given above regarding claims 11 and 14, claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 are also not anticipated by Guscho.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 11-16 under 35 USC §102(b) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the claims in the application are now in condition for allowance, and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicants' agent urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 5, 2008



Ware, Fressola, Van der Sluys & Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224
Tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955

Shiming Wu
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 56,885